

BAUR/12408/7-51/JAG.

1/ December, 1945.

C-in-C.

Proceedings of the BERLIN Military Court (War Crimes)  
for confirmation.

The trial began on 17th September and ended 17th November,  
1945.

Thirty of the 45 accused were found guilty. Eleven were  
sentenced to death; one to imprisonment for life; five to imprisonment  
for 15 years; nine to imprisonment for 10 years; two to imprisonment for  
5 years; one to imprisonment for 3 years, and one to imprisonment for 1  
year.

There were two charges (see Appendix 1), the first against  
all the accused in relation to the concentration camp at BERGHA-BELSEN, and the  
second against 11 of them in relation to the camp at AUSCHWITZ. In each  
charge it was alleged that the accused were members of the staff of the  
concentration camp and responsible for the well being of the prisoners  
interned there.

The charges are based on the obligations of a belligerent  
to prisoners of war and to the inhabitants of occupied territory. They  
are joint charges, the substance of which is that each of the accused  
took a part, greater or less, in a concerted system of murder, brutality,  
cruelty and criminal neglect.

The accused were not charged with individual murders,  
though many such were proved against a number of them. On the charges  
as framed the case for the prosecution against an individual accused was  
established, once the Court was satisfied that he or she was a member of  
the staff of the camp and that his or her actions were proved to be such  
as identified him or her with the system of ill-treatment, assuring that  
the system itself was established, of which there was indeed no question.

This point is of some importance, since the Court  
differentiated considerably in sentences between the accused, and in the  
cases of some, against whom specific allegations of murder were made in  
evidence, plainly discounted these allegations, and yet sentenced the  
accused to imprisonment on grounds either of other instances of ill-  
treatment or of general participation.

Some of the accused were not members of the SS or paid  
officials of the Reich, but were themselves internees employed as  
"functionaries" (Camp foremen, Block foremen, Room orderlies, Camp Police,  
etc) and bribed with privileges to take an active part in camp control.

The trial is known as the "Belsen" Trial since it arises  
out of the circumstances in which that camp was uncovered.

It has to be remembered that the call for investigation  
to which these revelations gave rise was one for which no preparation and  
no designation of responsibility had been made, or machinery set up.  
Consequently investigation of the allegations and the collection of  
evidence, though pursued energetically, took time to correlate and put on  
a systematic basis.

Reference:-

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

WO 235/605

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

During investigation it became clear that a large number of the staff and internees at Belsen had only been there for a short period, and had been transferred from Auschwitz, a camp of long standing and notorious for its cruelties. It was decided therefore, as so large a number of those in custody were on the staff of both camps, to try the issues together.

These issues in respect of Auschwitz centre round the gas chamber solutions. At Belsen, where there was no gas chamber, the main allegations are of starvation, inhuman punishments, beating and shooting, and general criminal neglect.

The hearing of the charges from start to finish occupied 54 days. The oral evidence and addresses are recorded in a shorthand note, necessarily voluminous, and there is a volume of affidavits, taken mainly during the early days of investigation from internees who were not available to give evidence in person at the trial.

The Court, as is obvious from their decisions, weighed the evidence against each accused most carefully.

The Judge Advocate, in a summing-up which extended into three days, re-presented to them the evidence for and against each accused, distinguishing between the 'live' evidence of the witnesses who had appeared before them, and the affidavits, and commenting freely on their evidential value.

I do not therefore think it necessary to attempt to set out even in brief the evidence against each accused and the defence put forward on his or her behalf; and will merely record for convenience of reference the position occupied by the particular accused and the general substance of the allegations against him or her.

I have satisfied myself that there were in each case ample grounds on which the Court could find those allegations proved.

With the exception of four of Polish nationality who were ably defended by a Polish officer, the accused were represented by a number of British officers with legal qualifications, who discharged a thankless, and in some cases unfamiliar, duty with energy. In view of their submission that they were inexperienced in questions of International Law, material to the defence of the accused, they were given the assistance of Counsel experienced in this branch of law.

I summarise below the arguments presented by this officer (Colonel H.A. Smith) and the replies thereto by the Prosecutor (Colonel Lockhouse).

#### Colonel Smith's Argument.

(1) To be a war crime the act or conduct must be directly connected with operations of war.

Concentration camps were a pre-war institution.

The responsibility for putting a POW in a concentration camp is with the German high authorities, not on the camp guards.

(2) The only war crimes civilians such as the accused can commit are illegitimate hostilities in arms, espionage, war treason and murdering.

(3) The expression 'Allied Nationals' does not include Italians or Hungarians nor does it include Poles and Czechs since Germany had annexed Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

(4) The concentration camp system was legal in Germany, the authority given to Hitler covering even the institution of gas chambers.

Where International and Municipal Law conflict the citizen must obey Municipal Law.

(5) This Court administers International Law and is not bound by the Royal Warrant or the IMT. Moreover the law it administers is the law at the time of the offenses and not later amendments.

The amendment to IMT correcting the rule as to validity of the excuse of superior orders is unwarranted.

The real question is: "Had these people any freedom of choice?"

#### Colonel Padhouse's Reply.

(1) It was the operations of war that brought Allied Nationals into German hands and the employment of slave labour was essentially connected with them.

The fact that ill-treatment of Jews began before the war is immaterial.

Allied Nationals in concentration camps were either prisoners of war, residents in Germany interned or deportees from occupied territory. All are covered by the Geneva Convention, Article 46, and an interned civilian is undoubtedly to be treated as a POW.

(2) Ill-treatment of prisoners of war is a war crime even if owing to the manpower situation civilians are put in charge of them.

The Hague Convention did not contemplate the SS.

Himmler himself claimed to be a member of the Armed Forces.

(3) A claim to annexation of occupied territory can only become valid when the war is over.

(4) No German law has declared gas chambers legal.

All the accused knew they were doing wrong and have said so.

The Leipzig trials acknowledged individual responsibility for war crimes and no German can be heard to deny this (see also SS Poles trial).

(5) I do not extend the principles of International Law; I carry them to their logical conclusion.

The amendment to the IMT on Superior Orders was not a novelty in 1944 - it was inserted to bring the book into line with accepted authority.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

Another legal argument raised on behalf of certain "prisoner-functionaries" was that, being themselves prisoners and victims of the Nazi regime, they could not, especially in the case of those who were themselves Allied Nationals, be guilty of a war crime. To this the prosecutor replied that an Allied National can commit a war crime against another Allied National if he is an accomplice of enemy Nationals who commit them and identifies himself with their criminal regime. The Court in their special finding specifically excluded reference to the two victims of Hungarian nationality.

The Judge Advocate in his summing-up advised the Court that they were entitled to hold that the subjection of Allied Nationals to the gas chamber system was a violation of the laws and customs of war.

In regard to the defence of Superior Orders he advised the Court in the sense of IHL, Ch. XIV, para 443, preferring to quote from the somewhat more elaborate passage in the 6th Edition of Oppenheim (1940).

He did not discuss in detail the other contentions mentioned above, but the issues upon them were fully before the Court.

I see no reason to conclude that the Court needed further direction, or were not made fully cognizant of considerations material to their decisions.

It may be observed that the charges in this case against the various accused were framed in their precise form by the Judge Advocate General, after consideration with other authorities in the UK, and that a US War Crimes Court has already tried and convicted the civilian staff of a "hospital" for the systematic extermination of Allied National slave-workers (the Hadamar case).

In my opinion none of the legal arguments raised are of such force as to call for the refusal of confirmation of the findings of this Court.

Of the circumstances of the offences and the conditions prevailing in the two camps, the most graphic and, I think it is safe to say, reliable accounts may be found in the evidence of:-

Brigadier Glyn Hughes	Days 2 & 3.
Mr. Le Duillennec	Day 4.
Dr. Ada Binko	Days 5 & 6.
Dr. Bandal	Day 13.

The full list of the accused showing those who were found guilty in respect of AUSCHWITZ and BERGEN respectively, together with their sentences, is attached as Appendix II.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

The following were sentenced to death:-

- (1) Joseph WINTER: Age 39. 13 years service in SS. Had built a gas chamber at HANAUER R. Was Commandant of one of the Camp Areas at AUSCHWITZ. Chief Commandant at BIRKEN. Was responsible for supervision of, and did supervise, selections for the gas chamber. He was also responsible for and was proved to be callous in regard to the horror of BIRKEN in April, 1945.
- (2) Fritz KRAUSE: (Medical officer). Age 57. Served in SS for one year. Admits having made selections himself at AUSCHWITZ. He knew it was murder. His excuse was that, if he did not, someone else would, and that he generally selected the incurable. In respect of BIRKEN he tried to deny responsibility, but there was clear evidence of criminal neglect until he was spurred by the imminent advent of the British.
- (3) Peter WITKOWSKI: Age 32. Two and a half years in SS. In 1942 was a Block Fuhrer and head of labour gang at AUSCHWITZ. Was an early transfer to BIRKEN, where he beat a sick man to death and deprived workers of their rations. General evidence of beating prisoners with rubber hose.
- (5) Franz HOFER: Age 39. Joined SS in 1933. Had 10 years experience as concentration camp official. As a camp leader he admitted taking an active part in selection parades; and dramatic evidence was given of his intervention in a particular instance.
- (6) Juana BORMANN: Age 49. Having worked in a charitable institution she volunteered for SS in 1938. She achieved notoriety even among her colleagues as the woman who set her dog on the prisoners. There was a mass of evidence against her including officiousness on gas selection parades.
- (7) Elizabeth VOIGT: Age 27. Joined SS in 1941. In AUSCHWITZ from 1942. She was appointed a head overseer on arrival at BIRKEN. She admits some violence to prisoners and her presence on gas selections. Oral evidence was given that she beat prisoners with a rubber truncheon and there were several affidavits to the same effect.
- (9) Ina GRUBER: Age 22. Joined SS in 1942. After Juana Bormann she was perhaps the most sinister and hated figure. In spite of her youth she was put in charge of 50,000 prisoners. She admitted taking a vigorous part in selections and rounding up stragglers with a whip. There was also evidence that she sent women prisoners to approach the wire fences where they would be, and were, shot by guards. At BIRKEN the evidence against her was of beating and of "taking Sport", a vigorous undignified and exhausting form of PT.
- (16) Earl BIANCHI: Age 33. Joined the SS in 1940. The most damning evidence in his case was of indiscriminate shooting of prisoners around the cookhouse at BIRKEN shortly before liberation.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

(22) Anger FUCHS:

Age 32. Of Polish origin. He claimed to be a Wehrmacht soldier employed on guard duties only and never to have worn SS uniform. He was partially disabled by a wound in the hand. He arrived at BELSEN in March, 1945. When on duty in the kitchen he shot prisoners who tried to get food.

(25) Franz HAGEN  
and

(27) Wilhelm DOR:

Age 30. SS since 1936.

Age 24. SS since 1940.

Together took a convoy of internees in April, 1945, from KLEIN-DODINGEN to BELSEN in conditions of great hardship and systematically shot stragglers.

It will be noted that all the above were in official authority in the administration of the camps, and none of them "prisoner-functionaries".

#### Sentences of Imprisonment.

(8) Herta MILNE:

15 years). Age 41. Served in SS since 1940. Arrived at BELSEN in March, 1945, as head overseer. Numerous witnesses speak of her habitual beating of prisoners and gave individual instances of her cruelty.

(11) Helde LABAU:

(10 years). Age 27. A German who was interned in 1940 for refusal to work in munitions. Employed in 1944-5 as supervisor of working gangs inside the camp. General evidence of beating prisoners. She admits carrying a stick and using it.

(19) Otto GALLER:

(15 years). Age 53. An ex-sergeant who was called up for SS in 1944. He was in charge of a rail transport of prisoners from DOW to BELSEN in April, 1945. Many of his charges died of starvation and thirst.

(20) Nedialaw BUKHAR:

(5 years). Age 27. Interned in 1940. A 'functionary' at BELSEN. Became notorious as carrying a thick stick or table leg with which he beat prisoners.

(26) Heinrich SCHER:

(15 years). Age 22. The evidence against him was that as an SS Block Fuhrer at AUSCHWITZ he bullied and ill-treated prisoners. He claimed to be a medical corporal in the Luftwaffe, and produced documents in support of a plausible alibi, which the Court discredited.

(29) Eric SCHUL:

(Life imprisonment). Age 32. A German with a criminal record. Interned for evasion of military service. Reached BELSEN in March, 1944, and was employed as a Camp Functionary. The evidence against him was of general brutality and beating prisoners.

I understand that SCHUL has already been sentenced to death by a Military Government Court for an offense committed since the liberation of BELSEN.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1 2 3 4 5 6



- 31) Vladislaw GEMOWSKI: (15 years). Age 31. A Pole who was first interned in 1940. As a Kape (functionary) of a convoy of prisoners from DORA to BIELSEN he beat them, and again in BIELSEN when employed as Room-orderly.
- 32) Antoni AUBERGER: (10 years). A Pole age 21. Deported in 1941. He was accused when employed at BIELSEN as "Block foreman" of beating prisoners with an iron bar. He had made a confession of this which at the trial he said was extorted from him.
- 33) Ilsa FRIEDL,  
38) Freida WALTER,  
39) Irene HARKKE,  
40) Gertrude FIEST,  
41) Gertrude SAUER,  
and  
42) Hilde LISIENITZ: Were all Germany factory employees who, being selected to act as supervisors of slave labour, were conscripted into SS and given training at a concentration camp at LANGENHAUSEN for this purpose.
- FRIEDL: (10 years). Age 23. Came to BIELSEN in February, 1945, as Kitchen overseer. Was accused of beating and savage cruelty to internees who tried to get food. Like many others she admitted mild chastisement of would-be thieves.
- WALTER: (3 years). Age 23. Came to BIELSEN in February, 1945. In charge of a gardening gang; used a spade to beat them.
- HARKKE: (10 years). Age 24. A kitchen supervisor at BIELSEN against whom there were detailed allegations of beating and one of pushing prisoners into a pond.
- FIEST: (5 years). Age 27. She beat prisoners and made them kneel in the snow.
- SAUER: (10 years). Age 39. General allegations of beating. She knocked a male prisoner senseless with a stick.
- LISIENITZ: (1 year). Age 23. Evidence of beating prisoners, but other evidence that she was ill for a long period and generally behaved well.
- (37) Herta DUMER: (10 years). Age 24. She joined the SS in November, 1942. Came to BIELSEN as Overseer in February, 1945. Several witnesses speak of her beating prisoners with a stick.
- (43) Johanna BUCH: (10 years). Age 32. A German interned in 1941 for political reasons. She came to BIELSEN in January, 1945. Was employed as Room Orderly and assisted the staff by beating sick prisoners to get them on the parades, the protracted and exhausting character of which was one of the cruelties of both AUBERGER and BIELSEN.
- (44) Ann HIEPZL: (10 years). Age 45. Joined the SS in 1944. A kitchen overseer in BIELSEN who admits using a stick, but was accused of using a rubber truncheon.
- (46) Helena KOBER: (15 years). Age 35. A Pole who was interned in 1940 for being found in possession of Anti-German leaflets and spent two years in a punishment gang. She was employed as a Block-foreman and was accused of beating prisoners and making them kneel. It was clear that she had acted as an informer to the SS and owed her survival to this. She gave important evidence as to concentration camp conditions.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1
2
3
4
5
6

(48) Stanislawa KAROLSKA:

(10 years). A Polish internee age 28. At AUSCHWITZ she was a Block Forewoman and later Camp Forewoman who kept order on gas selections. She claimed that under the cloak of apparent severity she was a real friend to her fellow prisoners. She did apparently favour certain of her countrywomen.

#### PETITIONS.

Petitions have been received from 21 of the accused and are attached. The following is a summary of the points contained in them.

Many of the petitions specifically adopt the arguments put forward by Colonel Smith at the trial. As I have dealt with these already, I do not note them again.

(1) Joseph KRAMER:

The conditions at BIRKENAU were outside my control. I protested at the overcrowding and asked for supplies. My protests were ignored. I can only do my duty as a soldier. At least I did not, like others, leave my post. At AUSCHWITZ my duties as Commandant gave me no responsibility for or discretion over the gas chambers.

The petition is accompanied by an appeal for mercy from Frau KRAMER.

#### OBSERVATIONS:

The points raised in the petition were fully before the Court.

(3) Peter HEIMMELHUT:

- (1) Against finding (Colonel Smith's arguments).
- (2) Against sentence.

I had nothing to do with the gas chamber at AUSCHWITZ. I never killed an internee. I am a Yugo-Slav forced to work for the Germans.

#### OBSERVATION:

The petition in my opinion discloses no sufficient ground for refusing confirmation of the finding.

#### Joint Petition:

- (5) Frans HOSLER,
- (6) Juana BORRARI,
- (7) Elizabeth VOLKHEIM,  
and
- (8) Herta HILKE.

Against finding (Colonel Smith's arguments).

HOSLER: I was present at gas selections under duress and took no malicious part. There was evidence that I tried to improve camp conditions. No personal brutality was proved against me. I was found not guilty in respect of BIRKENAU.

VOLKHEIM: The death sentence implies that undue weight was given to written evidence.

BORRARI: The oral evidence is so uncertain and is so contradictory as to dates as to be unreliable. Since the oral evidence when tested was proved unreliable I should not be convicted on written evidence which could not be tested.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10



REMARK: Evidence even if accepted does not warrant so severe a sentence. Insufficient weight was attached to my unshaken evidence. Evidence was given which showed me in a favourable light.

OBSERVATIONS:

All the matters raised were before the Court.

- (9) Irma GERSH  
and  
(11) Hilde ZABAUER:

Complain that the Judge Advocate:-

- (1) quoted only the law as stated in a book published in 1944. (The book was in fact published in 1940).
- (2) Omitted to deal with the law at sufficient length.
- (3) Omitted to direct the Court on the other points raised by Colonel Smith, and as to the proof of combination or concerted action necessary in law to find the accused guilty of a joint offence.
- (4) Failed to direct the Court as to the circumstances in which they could receive as evidence against one accused evidence given against the other accused.
- (5) Omitted to direct the Court as to what is meant by an Unchallenged Rule of Warfare.

The petition also draws attention to the youth of GERSH, 21 at the material time, and points to her as the victim of superior orders and Nazi environment.

OBSERVATIONS:

The prosecutor addressed the Court on the subject of combination and common purpose correctly.

The Court being free to receive written evidence and well advised and qualified to judge as to the weight to be attached to the various kinds of evidence, did not, in my view, require special direction.

The relevant rules of warfare, the question of their authority and general acceptance by civilised nations were fully before the Court, who were in no way misdirected on them.

- Joint Petition:  
(16) Karl FRANKFEL  
(45) Johanna ROTH  
and  
(44) Anna HILBERG.

The accused were found guilty in respect of BIRKEN only. There was no evidence that the occurrences at BIRKEN constituted a violation of the unchallenged laws and usages of war. The Judge Advocate did not sufficiently direct the Court on this point, or upon the legal arguments submitted by Colonel Smith.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

OBSERVATIONS:

The prosecutor drew the attention of the Court to the relevant rules of war as to the treatment of Prisoners of War and of the inhabitants of occupied territory, and the Court were fully entitled to hold that these rules were "unchallenged" in the sense of being recognised and accepted as binding on civilised nations. The Judge Advocate dealt with the point when it was raised at the trial (day 48, page 24).

(48)

(48) Stanislaw STAROSTKA:

The petition contains a detailed analysis of the evidence for and against her, which cannot well be summarised, and, in particular, points out that her share, if any, in gas selections was purely mechanical and that she was well thought of by many of her fellow-prisoners.

In mitigation it is further urged that she had been sentenced to death by the Gestapo and has served over five years in prison and concentration camps already.

CONCLUSIONS:

I do not find in the petition any grounds for overruling the finding of the Court upon the weight of the evidence.

(31) Vladislaw GUSKOWSKI:

As in Starostka the petition analyses the evidence pro and con, and complains that undue credit has been attached to affidavits in preference to sworn evidence. The accused was himself an internee for over three years but is sentenced as heavily as some SS officials.

OBSERVATIONS:

In this case again the weight of the evidence, which was fully thrashed out at the trial, was a matter for the Court.

(25) Franz KUCHEL:

This accused was charged only on the BRESEN charge and was prejudiced by the two charges being dealt with together. The finding was against the weight of evidence.

OBSERVATIONS:

The application for severance was dealt with by the Court and fully considered. I find no reason for refusing confirmation.

(22) Agner TERNI:

(1) Prejudiced by the joinder of charges.

(2) It was not proved that the prisoners he shot were Allied nationals.

(3) Finding is against the weight of evidence.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6



APPENDIX 1.1st Charge.COMMITTING A WAR CRIME

in that they

at Bergen-Belsen, Germany, between 1 October 1942 and 30 April 1945 when members of the staff of Bergen-Belsen Concentration Camp responsible for the well being of the persons interned there, in violation of the law and usages of war were together concerned as parties to the ill-treatment of certain of such persons causing the deaths of Keith Moyer (a British national), Anna Kis, Sara Kohn (both Hungarian nationals), Hejmech Glinovjechy and Maria Konatkevich (both Polish nationals) and.....Allied nationals and other Allied nationals whose names are unknown and physical suffering to other persons interned there, Allied Nationals, and particularly Harold Oswald le Drullenec (a British national), Reneo Luckermann, a female internee named Korporova, a female internee named Hoffmann, Jube Rozmann, Ida Frydmann (all Polish nationals) and Alexandra Siwidowa, a Russian national and other Allied nationals whose names are unknown.

2nd Charge.

- |   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| 1 Joseph KRAMER.                            | 6 Juana BOSCH.         |
| 2 Dr Fritz KLIN.                            | 7 Elisabeth VOLKHOVEN. |
| 3 Peter WILKINSON.                          | 8 Herta HILF.          |
| 4 George KRAFT.                             | 9 Irma GRISE.          |
| 5 HOFMEIER alias HOFER, 10 Ilse LUTHE.      |                        |
| alias BUSLER. 11 Hilde LORNER alias LORNER. |                        |

COMMITTING A WAR CRIME

in that they

at Auschwitz, Poland, between 1 October 1942 and 30 April 1945 when members of the staff of Auschwitz Concentration Camp and responsible for the well being of the persons interned there in violation of the law and usages of war were together concerned as parties to the ill-treatment of certain of such persons causing the deaths of Rachella Silberstein (a Polish national), Allied nationals and other Allied nationals whose names are unknown and physical suffering to other persons interned there, Allied nationals, and particularly to Ewa Gzyka and Hanka Rosenzweig (both Polish nationals) and other Allied nationals whose names are unknown.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	

APPENDIX II.LIST OF ACCUSED AND DEFENDERS AND RESULTS.

<u>NO.</u>	<u>NAME.</u>	<u>VERDICT.</u>	<u>SENTENCE.</u>
1.	Josef Kramer.	Guilty.	Death.
2.	Fritz Klein.	Guilty.	Death.
3.	Peter Weingartner.	Guilty.	Death.
4.	George Kraft.	Not Guilty.	-
5.	Hoessler.	-	Death.
6.	Juana Bornmann.	-	Death.
7.	Elisabeth Volkenrath.	Guilty.	Death.
8.	Herta Ehlert.	Guilty.	Impr. 15 yrs.
9.	Irma Grese.	Guilty.	Death.
10.	Ilse Lothe.	Not Guilty.	-
11.	Hilda Lobesur.	Guilty.	Impr. 10 yrs.
12.	Josef Klippel.	Not Guilty.	-
14.	Oscar Schmedidst.	Not Guilty.	-
16.	Karl Pirazich	Guilty.	Death.
17.	Ledislaw Gura.	(no finding by Court as accused absent from part of hearing through illness).	
18.	Fritz Mathes.	Not Guilty.	-
19.	Otto Calesson.	Guilty.	Impr. 15 yrs.
20.	Medislaw Burgraf.	Guilty.	Impr. 5 yrs.
21.	Karl Egersdorf.	Not Guilty.	-
22.	Anchor Pinchen.	Guilty.	Death.
23.	Walter Otto.	Not Guilty.	-
25.	Erans Stofel.	Guilty.	Death.
26.	Henrich Schreirer.	-	Impr. 15 yrs.
27.	Wilhelm Dor.	Guilty.	Death.
28.	Eric Barsch.	Not Guilty.	-
29.	Erich Lommel.	Guilty.	Impr. for life.
30.	Ignatz Schlomoivicz.	Not Guilty.	-
31.	Vladislav Ostrowski.	Guilty.	Impr. 15 yrs.
32.	Antoni Auzdziej.	Guilty.	Impr. 10 yrs.
33.	Ilse Forster.	Guilty.	Impr. 10 yrs.
34.	Ida Forster.	Not Guilty.	-
35.	Klara Opitz.	Not Guilty.	-
36.	Charlotte Klein.	Not Guilty.	-
37.	Herta Othe.	Guilty.	Impr. 10 yrs.
38.	Frieda Welter.	Guilty.	Impr. 3 yrs.
39.	Irene Haschke.	Guilty.	Impr. 10 yrs.
40.	Gertrude Fiest.	Guilty.	Impr. 5 yrs.
41.	Gertrude Sauer.	Guilty.	Impr. 10 yrs.
42.	Hilke Lisiewitz.	Guilty.	Impr. 1 yr.
43.	Johanne Roth.	Guilty.	Impr. 10 yrs.
44.	Anna Hempel.	Guilty.	Impr. 10 yrs.
45.	Hildegard Mahnel.	Not Guilty.	-
46.	Helena Kopar.	Guilty.	Impr. 15 yrs.
47.	Anton Polanski.	Not Guilty.	-
48.	Stanislawa Starostka.	-	Impr. 10 yrs.

Reference:-

WO 235/605

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

COPYRIGHT - NOT TO BE REPRODUCED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY WITHOUT PERMISSION